



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/291,983	04/15/99	MARTIN	J FM-259035

QM12/0811  
PILLSBURY MADISON & SUTRO LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW  
NINTH FLOOR EAST TOWER  
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3918

EXAMINER

DEXTER, C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 08/11/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/291,983**

Applicant(s)  
**Martin et al.**

Examiner  
**Clark F. Dexter**

Group Art Unit  
**3724**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 26, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 10-15 and 17-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 16, and 23 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed on May 26, 2000 is ☒ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3724

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed May 26, 2000 has been entered.

#### ***Drawings***

2. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on May 26, 2000 have been **approved**.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 4, line 2, "circumference" renders the claim vague and indefinite and appears to be inaccurate since it is not clear how a radius can be compared to a circumference, and it seems that "circumference" should read --radius--.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 3724

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9, 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over David in view of Wells, pn 679,653 (hereafter Wells '653).

David discloses a hacksaw with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention but lacks the frame member having an arcuate portion extending substantially the entire length between the forward end portion and the maximum height portion. Wells '653 discloses a frame member with such an arcuate portion and teaches that the curved characteristic and the tubular characteristic combined provide a desired degree of elasticity along with the requisite strength to strain the saw blade for cutting. It is noted that the I-beam-shaped frame member of David is considered an equivalent strengthening characteristic of the frame member of David. Further, the Examiner takes Official notice that it is old and well known in the art, particularly the mechanical arts, that corners or sharp bends or the like create stress risers wherein stress is concentrated in a relatively small area of a component which may lead to premature failure of the component in that area. It is further known that to alleviate this problem, the material in that area must be either "overdesigned" (i.e., designed with stronger material or enough additional material to provide the needed extra strength and endurance for a sufficiently long life for the component) or designed more "efficiently" without such corners or curves to eliminate the stress concentration areas which usually provides benefits such as requiring less material resulting in a lighter weight component. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 3724

provide the frame member of David with the claimed arcuate portion for providing an efficient design along with the other well known benefits described above as well as those taught by Wells.

Further, the specifics of the arcuate portion as defined in the dependent claims would be the mere discovery of the optimum or workable ranges within the general conditions of the prior art by routine experimentation and therefore obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

### ***Double Patenting***

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-9, 16 and 23 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claim of U.S. Patent No. Des. 403,224 to Martin et al. in view of Hepworth et al.

Martin et al. discloses a hacksaw frame and lacks an elongated blade attached to the frame by a first mounting structure and a second mounting structure in the form of a tensioning device.

However, to provide a blade and mounting structure to mount the blade onto the frame is inherent

Art Unit: 3724

in the invention of Martin et al. since it is a hacksaw frame which is intended to be used with such structure. Further, to provide a tensioning structure as one of the mounting structures is old and well known in the art as evidenced by Hepworth et al. for facilitating removal and assembly of the blade onto the saw frame. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide an elongated blade attached to the frame by a first mounting structure and a second mounting structure in the form of a tensioning device to perform the intended use of the frame and for the well known benefits including that described above.

### *Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark Dexter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1404.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at (703)308-2187.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148. The fax numbers for this group are: formal papers - (703)305-3579; informal/draft papers - (703)305-9835.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 USC 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [rinaldi.rada@uspto.gov].

Art Unit: 3724

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 USC 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Clark F. Dexter', is positioned above the printed name.

**Clark F. Dexter**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 3724**

cf  
August 8, 2000